

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
LUFKIN DIVISION

LEON D. BALL-VESSELL	§	
v.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 9:12cv208
MELVIN WRIGHT, ET AL.	§	

MEMORANDUM ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
AND ENTERING FINAL JUDGMENT

The Plaintiff Leon Ball-Vessell, proceeding *pro se*, filed this civil rights lawsuit under 42 U.S.C. §1983 complaining of alleged violations of his constitutional rights in the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Correctional Institutions Division. This Court ordered that the case be referred to the United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1) and (3) and the Amended Order for the Adoption of Local Rules for the Assignment of Duties to United States Magistrate Judges.

Ball-Vessell filed his lawsuit while in confinement, so he is required to pay the full filing fee of \$350.00 regardless of his subsequent release. Prior to his release, the Magistrate Judge ordered Ball-Vessell to pay an initial partial filing fee of \$10.06, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1915. When Ball-Vessell did not comply with this order, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the lawsuit be dismissed without prejudice for failure to prosecute or to obey an order of the Court. Ball-Vessell received a copy of this Report on or before March 6, 2013, but filed no objections thereto; accordingly, he is barred from *de novo* review by the district judge of those findings, conclusions, and recommendations and, except upon grounds of plain error, from appellate review of the unobjected-to proposed factual findings and legal conclusions accepted and adopted by the district court. Douglass v. United Services Automobile Association, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (*en banc*).

The Court has reviewed the pleadings in this cause and the Report of the Magistrate Judge. Upon such review, the Court has determined that the Report of the Magistrate Judge is correct. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918, 109 S.Ct. 3243 (1989) (where no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law."). It is accordingly

ORDERED that the Report of the Magistrate Judge (docket no. 7) is hereby ADOPTED as the opinion of the District Court. It is further

ORDERED that the above-styled civil action be and hereby is DISMISSED without prejudice for failure to prosecute or to obey an order of the Court. Finally, it is

ORDERED that any and all motions which may be pending in this action are hereby DENIED.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this **2** day of **May, 2013**.



Ron Clark, United States District Judge